

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 65-74 are pending. Claims 65 and 69 have been amended.

Rejection of Claims 13-22, 24, 58-63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 70 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner is respectfully referred to the specification at page 5, lines 4-11, for support for claim 70.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 65-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Semaan (U.S. Patent No. 5,680,392) in view of Sreenan (U.S. Patent No. 5,742,772). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

This response only addresses independent claims 65 and 69 with regard to the rejections over prior art. It will be appreciated that if the independent claims are patentable over the cited references, then claims that depend from the independent claims are by definition patentable over the same references. Applicants reserve the right to make additional arguments with regard to the dependent claims at a later date, should they be warranted.

The independent claims have been amended to more clearly point out that the multimedia terminals can be serviced by more than one MCU. Thus the central controller *decides which MCUs to use*, based on comparing the capability factors of the multimedia terminals and the available MCUs. This amendment is supported throughout the specification, for example, in Fig. 1. and at page 15 (discussing assigning one or more MCUs to host a conference.

This amendment further and more clearly distinguishes the present claims from the Semaan reference. The Semaan reference concerns a system wherein each of users (i.e., multimedia terminals) are serviced by only one MCU. *See* Semaan, Fig. 2 and 2a, and col. 6, lines 20-43. Thus, for a given conference, there is no question of which MCUs must be involved. For example, Semaan states:

However, where the set of users who will be party to the multimedia conference are serviced by multiple MCUs which are serviced by multiple reservation controllers, (such as users 112c, 112e, and 112f), then the reservation controller(s) (e.g., 130a, 130b) for the MCUs involved (e.g., MCUs 126a, 126b) ***will make determinations as to whether the necessary resources of the MCU 126a, 126b under their control will be available for the requested conference for the time requested.***

Col. 6, lines 35-43 [emphasis added]. The issue addressed by Semaan is not which resources to use, but rather, how to reserve the necessary resources, which are already known.

The presently pending claims are not only directed at reserving resources, but also at choosing the ***best*** resources from among the available resources, based on capability factors. The present amendment clarifies this point.

Neither Semaan nor Sreenan appear to teach a system where central controller chooses which MCU(s) to use from among multiple possibilities based on a comparison of capability factors. Thus, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over these references appears to be improper. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

To facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion, reconsideration, and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **June 29, 2006**

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,
Rutherford & Brucculeri, LLP
20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77070
832/446-2400
832/446-2424 (facsimile)
wcpatent@counselip.com

/Raymond Reese/

Raymond Reese
Reg. No. 47,891

Electronically submitted